88021a
15.12.00
Filed
By Shri
M.P. ... Tribunal,
RAIPUR

(3)

BEFORE THE HON'BLE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENCH RAIPUR

O.A.No._____2000 WP(S) 3479/05

APPLICANT .. .. Ravindra Kumar Sahu
Aged 35 years, son of
Shri Ramlal Sahu,
Upper Division Teacher
Govt.Girls' Higher Secondary School,
Dhamtari.

V/s

NON-APPLICANTS .. .. 1. State Govt. of Chhattisgarh
Through the Secretary
Education Department,
Govt.of Chhattisgarh,
Secretariat, Raipur (M.P.).

2. District Education Officer,
Dhamtari.

3. Principal,
Govt. Girls' Higher Secondary School,
Dhamtari,Distt. Dhamtari.

Application u/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act1985

(24)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (s) No. 3208 of 2005

Petitioner : Ku. Shailja Shrivastava
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. (s) No. 3479 of 2005

Petitioner : Ravindra Kumar Sahu
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. (s) No. 4176 of 2005

Petitioner : Premlal Dewangan
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4301 of 2005

Petitioner : Ram Kumar Choubey
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4308 of 2005

Petitioner : Kashi Ram Shrivas
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4343 of 2005

Petitioner : Shaka Ram Songerwa
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4344 of 2005

Petitioner : Neshwar Prasad Sahu
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4357 of 2005

Petitioner : Rupendra Kumar Sahu
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4367 of 2005

Petitioner : Leeladhar Sahoo
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

25

W. P. (s) No. 4416 of 2005

Petitioner : Smt. Aruna Reddi
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4438 of 2005

Petitioner : Smt. Bhagwati Vaishnava
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. (s) No. 4615 of 2005

Petitioner : Gopal Singh Kosma
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4626 of 2005

Petitioner : Smt. Vibha Verma
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4659 of 2005

Petitioner : Suresh Kumar Tiwari
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4690 of 2005

Petitioner : Hemraj Ladeshwar
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4696 of 2005

Petitioner : Manik Lal Dewangan
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

W. P. (s) No. 4810 of 2005

Petitioner : Bramha Ji Dewangan
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

And

W. P. (s) No. 5886 of 2006

Petitioner : Amar Singh Dewangan
Versus
Respondents : The State of Chhattisgarh & another

26

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Shri V.V.S. Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the State/respondents.

ORDER

(31st October, 2006)

1. The petitioners are working as Assistant Teachers/Upper Division Teachers in the government schools. In the course of their services as Assistant Teachers/Upper Division Teachers, the petitioners have obtained B. Ed./B.T.I. examination certificates on their own expenses before 1.3.1999.

2. Writ Petition (S) No.s 3208/2005, 3479/2005, 4176/2005, 4301/2005, 4308/2005, 4343/2005, 4344/2005, 4357/2005, 4367/2005, 4416/2005, 4438/2005, 4615/2005, 4626/2005, 4659/2005, 4690/2005, 4696/2005, 4810/2005 and 5886/2006 are being disposed of by this common order as the facts and question of law involved in these petitions are common.

3. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are entitled to two advance increments in view of the decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another {2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96}. This Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), came to the conclusion that the teachers, who had obtained B. Ed./B.T.I. Examination Certificate on their own expenses, are covered by the circular dated 24.12.98 issued by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh.

4. Further in the matter of Smt. Manorama Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. and others { 2000 (1) M.P.L.S.R. 136 } the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, Gwalior Bench, while considering the circular dated 1.3.1999 wherein, it is provided that the Assistant Teachers, who have acquired B. Ed. degree at their own cost between 23.10.1964 and 7.5.1973 shall be entitled to two advance increments, relied on decision in the case of Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. & others passed in O.A. No.

(27)

1632/99, decided on 12.10.1999 wherein it is observed that the circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively. Thus, a teacher, may be Assistant Teacher, who has obtained B. Ed. degree before 1.3.1999 is entitled to two advance increments.

5. It is pointed out by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the then State of Madhya Pradesh had filed a Special Leave Petition against the orders passed by the Tribunal and the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed Special Leave Petition No. 1999/2000 filed against the order of the Tribunal. Therefore, the direction to the effect that the circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively, passed by the Tribunal, becomes final and the same shall be applicable to all the Assistant Teachers who have obtained B. Ed. examination certificate before 1.3.1999. It is further substantiated by a circular dated 17.10.2003 issued by the present State of Madhya Pradesh wherein the circular clearly states about the decision of the Supreme Court.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the facts and question of law involved in the present case are squarely covered by decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents fairly concedes and agrees with the averment made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the writ petitions are allowed in terms of the order passed in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), subject to verification of the fact as to whether the petitioners have acquired B. Ed./B.T.I. Examination Certificate on their own expenses as per the circulars dated 24.12.1998 and 1.3.1999 and further whether they have been paid two advance increments or not. No order as to costs.

8. A copy of this order be placed on record in connected matters.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash